16

17

18

19

26

28

WING YAN WONG, ESO. Nevada Bar No. 13622

2	GORDON REES SCULLY MANSUKHANI, LLP 300 South Fourth Street, Suite 1550	
3	Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Telephone: (702) 577-9300	
4	Direct: (702) 577-9310 Facsimile: (702) 255-2858	
5	E-Mail: wwong@grsm.com	
6	Attorneys for Defendant Portfolio Recovery Associates, LLC	
7	Torijono Recovery Associates, LLC	
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	DISTRICT OF NE	VADA
10	GUILLERMO T. ACHURRA, JR.	Case No.: 2:20-cv-00053-RFB-NJK
11	Plaintiff,	MOTION TO EXTEND TIME FOR
12	v.	PORTFOLIO RECOVERY ASSOCIATES, LLC TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT (ECE No. 1)
13	PORTFOLIO RECOVERY ASSOCIATES, LLC,	TO COMPLAINT (ECF No. 1)
14	Defendants.	(Second Request)
15		

Pursuant to Local Rule IA 6-1, Defendant Portfolio Recovery Associates, LLC ("PRA"), by and through its attorneys, moves for an extension of time to respond to the Complaint (ECF No. 1) up to and including March 24, 2020. This is PRA's second request for extension of time to respond to the Complaint.

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

- 1. On January 9, 2020, Plaintiff files the Complaint in the above-entitled action (ECF No. 1). Based on belief and information, PRA's response was due on February 18, 2020.
- 2. PRA, a corporate defendant, was seeking to retain counsel and has recently retained counsel. In the meantime, opposing counsel and PRA had directly agreed to an extension for PRA to respond to the Complaint by March 10, 2020. See ECF No. 6.
- 3. PRA respectfully requests additional time to evaluate and respond to the Complaint. This action concerns phone calls PRA allegedly placed to Plaintiff, which Plaintiff claims to be in violation of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act. See ECF No. 1, at ¶¶ 1, 11-

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 13. Since the inception of this case, PRA has requested the phone number upon which Plaintiff bases his claims in this action. This information is necessary for PRA to perform the requisite review of its files, in order to meaningfully respond to the Complaint.
- 4. On February 3, 2020, Plaintiff, through his counsel Mr. David Krieger, provided PRA with a phone number, but PRA was unable to locate any calls such that this could be the phone number at issue in Plaintiff's pleading. On several occasions between February 4 and February 18, 2020, PRA requested from Mr. Krieger any additional phone number(s) that Plaintiff may base his claims upon. Mr. Krieger responded that to date, he had no new information from Plaintiff.
- 5. On February 25, 2020, PRA's counsel again followed up with Mr. Krieger for the requested information but received no response.
- 6. On February 26, 2020, Mr. George Haines informed PRA's counsel that Mr. Krieger withdrew from Haines & Krieger, LLC on February 21, 2020. Mr. Haines also informed that he was contacting Plaintiff regarding PRA's request and hoped to have a response within a few days.
- 7. On March 3, 2020, PRA still had not received the requested information. PRA's counsel therefore followed up with Mr. Haines. Mr. Haines asked for an additional thirty (30) days for Plaintiff to identify this information.
- 8. On Saturday, March 7, 2020, Mr. Haines informed PRA's counsel that this action had been transferred to Mr. Krieger and his new firm, Krieger Law Group.
- 9. At this time, PRA is still left without the information necessary for PRA to investigate and respond to the Complaint. Thus, PRA requests an additional fourteen (14) days to file a responsive pleading.
- 10. The extension will result in minimal delay. There are no current deadlines that will be affected by this extension.
- 11. This motion is not made for the purpose of delay or any other improper reasons, but only to allow PRA to respond fully and accurately to the Complaint in this case.